DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 377 110 SO 024 421

AUTHOR Bjerstedt, Ake
TITLE Disarmament Education, Education for International Understanding, Global Education, Peace Education and Other Related Terms: Comments and Preferences in a Group of Experts. Peace Education Miniprints No. 61.
INSTITUTION Lund Univ. (Sweden). Malmo School of Education.
REPORT NO ISSN-1101-6418
PUB DATE Apr 94
NOTE 47p.
AVAILABLE FROM "Preparedness for Peace," School of Education, Box 23501, S-200 45 Malmo, Sweden.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Disarmament; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; Global Approach; *Global Education; International Education; *International Relations; *Interviews; *Peace
IDENTIFIERS *Peace Education

ABSTRACT

Fifty experts, representing 22 countries provide their comments and views on the use of terms such as "disarmament education" and "peace education" in international debates. Part 1 of the report presents a summarization of the major characteristics of the answers. Some of the interviewees emphasize that the terms are not interchangeable and that it is useful to be equipped with a variety of terms in dealing with this group of educational endeavors. Separate discussions present the view of the terms "education for international understanding," "disarmament education," "global education," "peace education," and other terms. Some of the experts indicate that there is a need for flexibility of terms and for new terms. Part 2 gives more detailed documentation of the 50 interview replies. (CK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

DISARMAMENT EDUCATION, EDUCATION FOR INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING, GLOBAL EDUCATION, PEACE EDUCATION AND OTHER RELATED TERMS

Comments and Preferences in a Group of Experts

Åke Bjerstedt

"In international debates, the terms 'disarmament education' and 'peace education' have been used, in addition to some other related terms ('global education', 'education for international understanding' etc.). Do you have any comments or preferences as to this terminology?" Answers to this question, put to a group of experts in the field, are documented and discussed in the present report.

PART I

People interested in exploring the possibilities of educational approaches that may help prepare children and young people for a more peaceful future, giving them insights and skills that would make them less prone to see violence as the natural way to deal with conflict, will find a bewildering richness of expressions and terms when looking for relevant literature in the field. This "embarras de richesse" would, for example, include terms such as disarmament education, education for international understanding, global education, and peace education – as well as many other related expressions. When interviewing a group of international experts in the field, it seemed natural to elicit their reactions to this terminology.

The question was formulated in the following way: "In international debates, the terms 'disarmament education' and 'peace education' have been used, in addition to some other related terms ('global education', 'education for international understanding' etc.). Do you have any comments or preferences as to this terminology?" Part I of this report presents my attempt to summarize some major characteristics of the answers, while Part II gives a more detailed documentation of the interview replies. This documentation contains material from fifty experts, representing twenty-two countries. More information on the group of interviewees is available in a separate report (Bjerstedt, 1993a).

1.

Defending the variety of terms. Some of our interviewees emphasize that the terms are not interchangeable, and that it is useful to be equipped with a variety of terms in dealing with this group of educational endeavours. For example:

"They are certainly not the same, and I think they should all be used to describe the variety of approaches in our profession." (Celina Garcia.)

"There are many more related terms. ... I don't agree too much with people who feel that we need one great umbrella term for all these aspects. I think at this stage people should feel free to feel strongly about various aspects of education and work for them all." (Mildred Masheder.)

"The terms mentioned refer to different, although related topics, that is, they are not substitutional. They are based on different assumptions about the nature and causes of global problems and therefore use somewhat different analytic and pedagogical approaches." (Betty Reardon.)

2.

Education for international understanding is an expression that has been used for a fairly long time, among other things, in work related to UNESCO. This means it has the advantage of being relatively well-known and not prone to evoke resistance to the same degree as some other terms. On the other hand – that is the opinion given by some of our interviewees – it is relatively limited in its scope, referring to just one of many factors of importance for peace work. It is also experienced by several respondents as rather vague. In addition, the implicit focus on "nation" is mentioned as a drawback. Some characteristic formulations from our expert group follow:

"Nobody is against international understanding – it isn't controversial at all. But international understanding will not include human rights, it doesn't mean developing the third world." (Susan Alexander.)

"The trouble with 'international understanding' is that we have used it for years and it has almost no content. There is nothing wrong with it per se, but with the way it has been used." (Elise Boulding.)

"The expression 'international understanding' appears, of course, in UNESCO's recommendations, and it is a common term in connection with UNESCO's Associated Schools Project. It is a broad concept, and hence it has certain similarities with the concept of peace education, but one does not usually include in it, to the same degree, questions of armament races and the like. One thinks more along the lines of understanding among nations and removing prejudices, than of economic and social structures." (Birgit Brock-Utne.)

"I find the term 'education for international understanding' a little bit vague; we have for a long time had that aim in New Zealand within our social studies programme, but I do not know that it moves over into action." (James Collinge.)

"I have never been drawn to 'education for international understanding', maybe especially because I've had the impression that it's such a de-politicized concept." (Magnus Haavelsrud.)

"The term 'education for international understanding' I look upon as rather 'wet'. It has been used rather loosely in the U.K. for a long time. From the 1920s on there is a tradition in England for international understanding, but in these days we're more likely to talk about global education or peace education." (David Hicks.)

"Education for international understanding is now an archaic term. You must deal with education for understanding among peoples, but the problem with the term international is the emphasis on nation. We have to deal with

differences among people, whether these differences are identified with language, religion, race, nation, or any other form of distinction. ... it's terribly important for kids to look at the relationships at both the personal and the global level, but the nation level is only one of many possible groupings, and we should not over-emphasize that." (Douglas Ray.)

3.

Disarmament education is also a term with a UNESCO tradition, although used during a shorter period of time. Among the terms explicitly mentioned in my question, this term was the one that received the most frequent negative comments, most often because it was felt to deal with a too specific and narrow field, but sometimes for other reasons (for example, for its explicit advocacy character). Some quotations may illustrate this:

"Almost nobody in the U.S. would use 'disarmament education'. In Europe I see it being used, however. In this country you can't do advocacy education. Disarmament education means to advocate disarmament and this is not seen to be legitimate. To us, 'educate' means to explore all points of view in their complexity and figure out how to make sense to yourself of all the contrasting viewpoints." (Susan Alexander.)

"I have felt that 'disarmament education' is a particularly unfortunate term because of its limited focus. I am more interested in education for a new understanding of security, education for world security." (Elise Boulding.)

"'Disarmament education' I have a little bit of difficulty with in that I feel it might give rise to those criticisms ... that say this is pushing forward a particular political view – it is going to indoctrinate people. ... I think that a term like disarmament education might be somewhat too explicit in a sense." (James Collinge.)

"I know when I first came across the term 'disarmament education' – I think that was in Magnus Haavelsrud's book – on the one hand I could understand that it was conceptually valuable within peace education. But also I thought that in busy classrooms and with busy teachers you don't start with that sort of terminology and that it wasn't helpful at all. It was difficult enough helping teachers to understand peace education, as a term they were not used to, without adding disarmament education as well!" (David Hicks.)

"To me ... 'disarmament education' would be far too narrow because it has implicit in it a particular approach to peace. I am in favour of dis-

armament; but I think that in some respects use of this term means falling into the trap I was talking about, i.e., looking at security in exclusively military terms." (Herbert C. Kelman.)

"As to the term disarmament education, I think that disarmament (if nothing more is done) is a very partial solution. It does not deal adequately with conflict resolution, and it does not deal adequately with the removal of injustices. By removing one of the means by which conflicts might be resolved, you do not necessarily promote resolution. So disarmament education is highly desirable, but unless a lot of other things take place at the same time, it is completely inadequate." (Douglas Ray.)

4.

Global education is a term that more respondents appreciated, although critical voices were sometimes heard. Its emphasis upon global perspectives (instead of just international relations) was mentioned as a good thing. Sometimes it was seen as a term that could be more widely accepted than peace education but that might be used to cover similar efforts. On the other hand, some of the respondents stressed that this term could be used to refer to quite different educational objectives (including some contrary to a peaceful approach). The following quotations will illustrate the variety of reactions:

"You may want 'global education' for political reasons or economic gain, but it may not be for peace, unless you bring in the world as a family and the fact that we are interdependent. If you bring in these factors, then why call it 'global education'? ... Some people say to me: 'international understanding' or 'global education' are better terms, because they are attractive to more people. But we are not people pleasers, we are peace educators. So let us stick to 'peace education'." (Anima Bose.)

"I prefer the term 'global education'. ... I suppose I would say 'educating for globalism', related to the theme of my book 'Building a global civic culture'. 'Education for world citizenship' is what I am interested in: that every person should see herself as a member of the world community with the responsibility she has to the world as well as to the country she happens to live in and the community she lives in." (Elise Boulding.)

"I like 'global education' because it entails the interconnectedness of human beings with the environment and the interconnectedness of human beings and human cultures with each other. It introduces a wider context than simple international understanding." (James Collinge.)

"I like 'global education', because it acknowledges that we want children

and adolescents to move beyond their egocentric and etnocentric concerns, and that we want them to be concerned about the future of the world, the future of all nations." (Petra Hesse.)

"I happen to believe that one of the most important things in thinking about peace is to adopt a global perspective. ... One of the assumptions built into our thinking is that the world by its nature is a system consisting of sovereign nation states. ... it's very important ... to recognize that nation states represent only *one* way in which the world can be organized, but that we often think about them as the only way. However, in many respects we are already operating as a global society, and we should certainly keep open the option of increasingly adopting a global framework. So to me the more appropriate way of looking at the so-called international system is as a global society, and in that sense a term like 'global education' appeals to me." (Herbert C. Kelman.)

"First I preferred the term 'international education', but now I think that 'global education' is better. Many of the problems that we have are really global." (Valentina Mitina.)

"... global education as developed at the York Centre for Global Education by Selby and Pike could be the broadest term for all kinds of positive education. Global education has five goals; they are systems consciousness; perspective consciousness; health of planet awareness; involvement consciousness and preparedness and process mindedness. Systems consciousness means the ability to think in a systems mode avoiding dualities like cause and effect, observer and observed, local and global and consider phenomena in interactive relations." (Hanns-Fred Rathenow.)

"I understand often why people use one term instead of another, and quite often this is because of the political context, the social context or the cultural context in which they are operating. I think it's very important to respect that so I try to be sensitive to that. If people are talking about global education rather than peace education, it *may* be to avoid a hostile reaction from other people that could actually interfere with the educational process." (Paul Smoker.)

"I can understand why, in some situations, some terms like 'global education' or 'international understanding' may have to be used in order to make progress in implementing peace education. So at a practical level it doesn't matter so much which term you use. But one has to be aware, when using 'global education', that there are conservative paradigms of 'global education' which are quite different from the peace education perspective. I have seen some curriculum materials, made in the name of 'global educa-

tion', which embody assumptions contrary to the peace paradigm." (Toh Swee-Hin.)

5.

Peace education was often the preferred term in the group of experts interviewed. This expression was in many cases seen as referring to the broadest concept, including various subfields. Several interviewees stressed the importance of using the essential word "peace" as an indicator of the basic value. However, the term "peace education" is still viewed as controversial by some people. As a consequence, some of the respondents refer to the ongoing debate about how to handle that situation: whether one should avoid the term in order to get the related educational programs more easily accepted, or whether one should insist on using the term in the hope of arriving step-by-step at a situation where words like peace and peace education are more generally accepted. Some examples of the reactions from our interviewees are the following (see also Bjerstedt, 1994):

"I prefer peace education. I think peace is the highest value. I am against talking about 'peace and justice', because to me peace includes justice." (Robert Aspeslagh.)

"Inasmuch as I work with a broad concept of 'peace', I regard 'peace education' as a generic term, a kind of umbrella concept. My concept of peace includes the absence of both direct violence and indirect, structural violence, so you could say that 'disarmament education', 'development education' and 'human rights education' are all parts of 'peace education'." (Birgit Brock-Utne.)

"... here in the U.S., we have the organization 'Educators for Social Responsibility'. ... they are very active, promoting peace education. However, they have decided, tactically, to use the word 'nuclear-age education'. Their thinking is that we are now living in a nuclear age, and that we need to understand and think about the ramifications of that age, that this period of time is different than any other period of time... For example, human beings now have the capacity to blow themselves up. ... Within that context they are promoting 'nuclear-age education' but basically teaching the same things that most of us who promote peace education are teaching.

I feel strongly that their terminological choice is a mistake. I am a member of that organization. I have publicly tried to get them to endorse peace education, and I have critized their terminology... Basically, I feel that studying 'nuclear-age education' is like a person who has a terminal disease, a cancer, spending the rest of your life studying that cancer... Peace

education talks about the abilities of human beings to love each other, to care for each other, to care for this planet, it draws upon deep feelings for social justice that exist in the human psyche. I think that using the term 'nuclear age education' is to focus on the worst aspects, whereas to study peace education is to draw upon the best aspects of the human personality. Therefore I am very much in favour of that terminology, even though it *is* controversial." (Ian M. Harris.)

"I think people in England find the terms 'global education' and 'world studies' less threatening than peace education. It doesn't sound as subversive as peace education! Certainly the project that I was involved with – the World Studies 8-13 Project – had a much wider take-up than things I did under a peace education heading, and teachers sometimes commented: 'I'm really glad that project was called 'World Studies'; if it should have been called Peace education 8-12, my head teacher wouldn't have allowed me to come on the course.' I actually think that one can equally study issues of peace and conflict under a global education heading." (David Hicks.)

"I prefer the term peace education that for me covers both disarmament education and the broader fields of global education. As I see it, it has the potential to be the truly comprehensive type of education we need in a global nuclear age." (Betty Reardon.)

"... we usually don't talk about peace education. I have problems with it. It isn't just for political reasons that people have attacked it. I don't think anybody wants war, so for us to say that we're doing peace education as distinct from what someone else is doing seems to me a little bit pretentious. I can see why the term bothers people." (Tom Roderick.)

"I personally prefer 'peace education'; any expression that has 'peace' in it. I think 'peace' is a very crucial word in the human vocabulary." (Toh Swee-Hin.)

"A lot of people have very deliberately gone away from the term 'peace', because it has 'political' associations, and some people feel that it's just not worth the trouble to push through all that, but it's much better just to change the term.

However, I think it's important to stick with the term peace, because I think it's important that *you* define its meaning rather than having its meaning defined elsewhere. ..." (Richard Yarwood.)

"I like the word 'peace'. The word 'education' has problems for me, so I would tend to talk ... about 'peace learning' or 'peace studies' rather than 'peace education', but I would keep the word 'peace'. It should be 'global', and it should include 'disarmament'. But 'peace', I think, is a good central

term." (Nigel Young.)

6.

Other terms. In another study, we asked the members of the Peace Education Commission (a sub-group of the International Peace Research Association) to fill in a questionnaire related to peace education. The following two questions were included: "Do teachers or school administrators often prefer to talk about issues related to peace education under other terms than 'peace education'? If yes: Which term or terms are most frequently used?" In the group of 80 respondents, there was a very large number of Yes responses (around 60 %) and fairly few No responses (around 25 %). The indications given above from our interviews are thus reinforced by the somewhat larger questionnaire study: Peace education is apparently still "a controversial term".

The alternative terms mentioned in reply to the follow-up question covered a large and multi-faceted spectrum (for further details, see Bjerstedt, 1993b).

In our interviews, the question on terms gave room for alternative suggestions. A broad variety of such alternative terms were mentioned in the answers. Often these additional terms had the character of preferred alternatives; sometimes they were just mentioned as other possible terms in use. Some examples follow:

"... education for social responsibility." (Susan Alexander.)

"... education for globalism... Education for world citizenship..." (Elise Boulding.)

"I think that the terms 'disarmament education' and 'peace education' could all be incorporated under one heading, that is to say 'international education'. We have a tendency to call our own program a program of 'international education' and then include peace studies within 'international education'." (James Calleja.)

"My preference for a term would be 'education for peace' or 'education for a peaceful future'. These have more positive connotations than 'peace education'." (Terry Carson.)

"As a kind of working umbrella term I tend to use the phrase 'peace and world order studies' which I find to be a useful, comprehensive expression. The term 'world order' was used back in the 20s and is now linking human rights issues, environmental issues, the global community concept and so on with peace issues." (Thomas Daffern.)

"You could also talk about education related to international law, for in-

stance – that is also an important part of peace education." (Celina Garcia.)

"... currently we are speaking of 'education (conceived as learning) on international conflicts and problems' – subdivided into questions of war, armament and peace, of underdevelopment and development, and of environmental pollution and protection." (Henk B. Gerritsma.)

"I think my preference would be 'education for peace, justice and human liberation'." (Kathleen Kanet.)

"I would prefer to say 'education for and about global interdependence'." (Gerald F. Mische.)

"I always like the term 'awareness'. We use the term 'bias awareness'. ... I like the term 'global awareness' too: that we begin to see ourselves as part of a whole." (Priscilla Prutzman.)

7.

Flexibility of terms. Need for new terms. Among the "meta comments" on the terminological issues raised in the interviews, two may be briefly mentioned. One is that language is in flux and has to be adapted to circumstances. Another is that terms in this area are still unsatisfactory, and it should be a task for interested parties to try to develop a better terminology. A few examples:

"Each term has tended to develop in particular contexts, and to be used in different ways by different users so that it is all very confusing. A new summary term may be called for at this point." (Robin Burns.)

"I have been interested in conflict resolution. I have also become more interested in media literacy education... Then, because this country is turning totally multicultural, I have been interested in multicultural education. ... All these specialities are ultimately related, so I think I'm searching for a word or some way of referring to all of them, but there seems to be no such term." (Petra Hesse.)

"... first of all I have a pragmatic attitude to terms in general: that you should take great pains to try to find the expressions that correspond best to what teachers and students actually say. As you know, language is a living thing in a constant state of change, and it could well be that none of the terms mentioned ... is quite appropriate." (Søren Kelldorff.)

"I use the terms alternately, depending on what I know about my listeners and what I want to achieve in communication with them." (Eva Nordland.)

"I wish we could find better terms, because I don't think any of those terms are good, but I haven't been able to think of a better term myself."

ED 377 110

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

HRE
BJERSTEDT

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(Tom Roderick.)

This terminological field apparently shows some signs of relative consensus, but also several indications of terminological instability – which may be natural in a relatively new area such as this. My hope is that this documentation of views may be useful for those working with these issues, increasing the awareness of the terminological situation as well as the readiness for continued development work on our instruments for communication in this area.

•

PART II

Susan Alexander (Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA)

Almost nobody in the U.S. would use "disarmament education". In Europe I see it being used, however. In this country you can't do advocacy education. Disarmament education means to advocate disarmament and this is not seen to be legitimate. To us, "educate" means to explore all points of view in all their complexity and then figure out how to make sense to yourself of all the contrasting viewpoints.
ÅB: Could you think of using the expression "education for peace", indicating that it would be more legitimate to advocate peace than disarmament?
SA: Probably not. At least many people in this country would interpret it like this: Oh, you mean: If the Russians try to take over, you just lay down your arms and let them capture you. – "Education for international understanding" is much less threatening. Nobody is against international understanding – it isn't controversial at all. But international understanding will not include human rights, it doesn't mean developing the third world. It will not lead to a more peaceful world.
ÅB: So, in fact, you don't like any of these terms?
SA: That's right. There are no problems with "global education" in the U.S., but I just think it means something else.
ÅB: So the term that you would prefer, would that be the term that you use in your organization?
SA: Yes, education for social responsibility.

Robert Aspeslagh (Amsterdam, The Netherlands)

I have written a book on this issue – which makes it difficult to give a brief answer! You can compare the different topics which are involved. You can have a pedagogical view and look at the pedagogical ends or approaches. You can also look at the common denominators or at the differences, for example, when dealing with migrant workers. Peace education will tend to put emphasis on conflict and value differences, and will not be so very tolerant in a way – interestingly enough. Intercultural education, on the other hand, tends to accept everything as an expression of our cultures, even undemocratic behavior. Peace educators would usually not accept that. So there are differences. There are common denominators also, and this is

what I have looked for.

ÅB: Have you investigated how these terms have been used historically?

RA: No, that is part of it, but it is not primary. I give some overviews of the discussions through the years. I see at least two main approaches in Western Europe.

One is in the Federal Republic of Germany, where you see a combination of ecology and peace, so ecology is very much part of peace education. The key word is "non-violence". Sometimes they talk about "Eko-Friedenspädagogik".

In the United Kingdom, another key may be used. If you use the key "justice", you will open the relationships between peace education, development education, intercultural education and world studies or global education.

ÅB: Have you any particular preference of your own as to what expression you would like to use?

RA: I prefer peace education. I think peace is the highest value. I am against talking about "peace and justice", because to me peace includes justice. But there might be several reasons for not using the term peace education anyway. We might need another word.

Anima Bose (New Delhi, India)

I prefer peace education, very definitely. "Disarmament education" is not necessarily peace education; it is some kind of negative expression. You may want "global education" for political reasons or economic gain, but it may not be for peace, unless you bring in the world as a family and the fact that we are interdependent. If you bring in these factors, then why call it "global education"? "International understanding" could be a factor in peace, I will admit that, but this expression may also be used for financial or foreign policy reasons. We need to be very clear about our educational objectives. And why should we play with words? It is a trick, I think. Some people say to me: "international understanding" or "global education" are better terms, because they are attractive to more people. But we are not people pleasers, we are peace educators. So let us stick to "peace education". And peace education in the classroom could be supported by peace clubs; what the students cannot do within the classroom could be done in the peace clubs. "Peace studies" could be another terminology – if not peace education.

Elise Boulding (Boulder, Colorado, USA)

I have felt that "disarmament education" is a particularly unfortunate term because of its limited focus. I am more interested in education for a new understanding of security, education for world security. I prefer the term "global education". The trouble with "international understanding" is that we have used it for years and it has almost no content. There is nothing wrong with it per se, but with the way it has been used. I suppose I would say "education for globalism", related to the theme of my book "Building a global civic culture". "Education for world citizenship" is what I am interested in: that every person should see herself as a member of the world community with the responsibility she has to the world as well as to the country she happens to live in and the community she lives in.

Birgit Brock-Utne (Oslo, Norway)

Inasmuch as I work with a broad concept of "peace", I regard "peace education" as a generic term, a kind of umbrella concept. My concept of peace includes the absence of both direct violence and indirect, structural violence, so you could say that "disarmament education", "development education" and "human rights education" are all parts of "peace education".

Some peace education deals mainly with the direct violence between countries, and that approximates what UNESCO means by "disarmament education". Nevertheless, there are several problems of terminology involved when one begins to talk about "education for disarmament" and "education about disarmament". The difference between "education *for* disarmament" and "education *for* peace" is not as great as that between "education *about* disarmament" and "education *about* peace". On the cognitive level there will be a number of differences.

"Human rights education" can also be regarded as a part of "peace education". Also here it is a question of education *about* and *for* human rights. In this area, there has been a certain gradual change and expansion. Previously, the usual point of departure was the more liberal notion of human rights involving freedom of the press, freedom of speech, and the freedom to assemble. Now, however, it is usual to include the freedom from economic oppression: "a hungry man is not a free man". Thus the different concepts overlap to some extent.

Both "human rights education" and "development education" deal with

structural violence. "Development education" concerns the third world, or underdevelopment in our own countries; among other things, it considers questions of equity, of equal distribution of resources.

ÅB: When these matters are discussed in Norway, do you use such terms as "education for international understanding" or "education for a global perspective"?

BB: Not very often. The expression "international understanding" appears, of course, in UNESCO's recommendations, and it is a common term in connection with UNESCO's Associated Schools Project. It is a broad concept, and hence it has certain similarities with the concept of peace education, but one does not usually include in it, to the same degree, questions of armament races and the like. One thinks more along the lines of understanding among nations and removing prejudices, than of economic and social structures. In any case, I prefer "peace education".

Robin Burns (Heidelberg, Victoria, Australia)

I have some problems, having moved from development education to peace education and having used various terms in my own studies. I am working towards a broad concept of social and political education oriented towards critical world issues. It is important to emphasize the interrelations of critical world problems, of which peace is an important example, but which must also include development and underdevelopment, justice, the environment etc.

When talking about global issues with teachers, their reaction is often: It is fine to talk about peace education, but the basic problem in my school is violence on the playground, and this violence comes from poverty and is often directed around newly arrived immigrants. So in that situation, it is useful to begin with the reality of the classroom and the playground and discuss the implications of the multi-cultural society. But it is very shortsighted if we do not add an international perspective. It is important to see that the situation of immigrants in Australia has something to do with the relations between nations.

I'm not even sure that peace education is the broadest concept. A current (early 1990s) phrase is 'ecologically sustainable future'. If we pull that apart and look at the components and interactions, we may find all the bits – from development and human rights to peace, disarmament and international understanding. Each term has tended to develop in particular con-

texts, and to be used in different ways by different users so that it is all very confusing. A new summary term may be called for at this point.

James Calleja (Valletta, Malta)

I am very much involved in international education. I think that the terms "disarmament education" and "peace education" could all be incorporated under one heading, that is to say "international education".

We have a tendency to call our own program a program of "international education" and then include peace studies within "international education". From a Unesco Tunis meeting, which was held late in September 1991, this was one of the themes which was debated during the three-day seminar: What should fall under "international education"? The two subjects that were seen as legitimate topics to be discussed under "international education" were precisely "peace education" and "human rights education". I think there was considerable agreement on this. So I would prefer to include under the word "international education" peace education and human rights education and stop at that, rather than carry on with "environment education" etc. As peace researchers or as peace educators I think we should be very specific on what to look into rather than open up to too many areas. Peace education should not be an umbrella concept but specifically concerned with the education *about* peace and *for* peace; peace as communication, cooperation, confidence building.

Terry Carson (Edmonton, Alberta, Canada)

I have just come from England, and I have been exposed to a lot of the debate there. In England peace education carries negative connotations for many people.

ÅB: Would that be true in Canada, too?

TC: No, less so in Canada, only among the very far Right and there are not that many on the ideological Right in Canada. The Canadians don't feel themselves nearly as threatened by the Soviets as people seem to in the U.S. or in Britain. So what happens is that the people who want to criticize peace education usually have to import such criticism, from Britain or from the United States.

My preference for a term would be "education for peace" or "education

for a peaceful future". These have a more positive connotation than "peace education".

ÅB: Would that be the term that you will use in your forthcoming book?

TC: I have to discuss that with David Smith, my co-author, but I am leaning in that way, and there may be good reasons to be hesitant about the term peace education.

ÅB: Would you prefer "education for peace" to "global education", "education for international understanding" and the other expressions referred to in my question?

TC: Yes, I think so. "Global education" might be a second choice, partly for pragmatic reasons because there is quite a bit of interest in global education in Canada now. But personally, I would like to keep the term "peace" in the expression used.

James Collinge (Wellington, New Zealand)

I like the term "peace education", because, as I indicated before, it introduces the attitudes and ways of proceeding that I think are important. "Disarmament education" I have a little bit of difficulty with in that I feel it might give rise to those criticisms of peace education that say that this is pushing forward a particular political view – it is going to indoctrinate people. This kind of criticism has been common within New Zealand, Australia, and Britain, for example and I think that a term like disarmament education might be somewhat too explicit in a sense. I find the term "education for international understanding" a little bit vague; we have for a long while had that aim in New Zealand within our social studies programme, but I do not know that it moves over into action. I do very much like the term "global education". I like "global education" because it entails the interconnectedness of human beings with the environment and the interconnectedness of human beings and human cultures with each other. It introduces a wider context than simple international understanding. "Global education" makes clear to me the relationship with peace education, environmental education, education for justice and antiracist education. So of the terms that you have mentioned, I prefer the terms "peace education" or "education for peace" and "global education".

Thomas Daffern (London, England)

I think all these terms are important. If I had to use a general overterm, I certainly would prefer "peace education" to "disarmament education". I feel that disarmament education is definitely a subfield. "Global education" and "education for international understanding" are both useful terms, the latter being related to the Unesco declaration of 1974, but going much further back. As a kind of working umbrella term I tend to use the phrase "peace and world order studies", which I find to be a useful, comprehensive expression. The term "world order" was used back in the 20s and is now linking human rights issues, environmental issues, the global community concept and so on with peace issues.

ÅB: When you think of "peace education" versus "peace studies", what are your connotions or preferences?

TD: I don't see them really as separate. Hearing "peace studies" I tend to think that all this is a more theoretical or high-level work – sixth form and university level; whereas "peace education" is used more for the lower levels of school. But obviously the fields are overlapping, and education is a lifelong process. You could argue that "peace studies" is maybe a fairly theoretical subfield of "peace education".

Morton Deutsch (New York, USA)

I don't like any of them, particularly. Disarmament or arms control or whatever you want to call it is just one particular aspect of a more general process that I have been describing. It requires becoming well informed about particular technical issues. I think that is valuable, but I don't think that is the essence. The essence is what I have been describing.

ÅB: When you say you don't like any of these terms particularly – what term would you prefer to use when describing this area?

MD: I am not sure. I haven't given any particular thoughts to terminology. It is really the emphasis that is important. For me it is central to help people learn how to work together as individuals and as groups, as organizations and as nations and help people learn how to deal with the inevitable conflicts that are going to occur at all levels of individual and social life, including international life. For particular areas you are going to have to learn about cultural ethnic and racial differences. In other areas you are going to have to learn about to trade and economic issues. The content of

the issues of conflict and collaboration vary enormously, but the generalities are the things I've mentioned.

Virginia Floresca-Cawagas (Quezon City, The Philippines)

A colleague of mine, Dr. Toh Swee-Hin, also a WCCI Board member, had several occasions to visit Philippine schools, observe the rural conditions and live with the people and together we developed a framework for peace education in the Philippines. In this framework we suggested that several peace and conflict issues need to be analyzed namely: militarism, human rights, structural violence, environmental care, cultural solidarity and personal peace. Thus, within this framework, "disarmament education" is only one of the components of peace education when we discuss militarism. "International understanding" is one of the goals we want to achieve that is why we have peace education. And "global education" would be dealt with in the concept of cultural solidarity, environmental care and structural violence. Furthermore, as I said earlier, peace education is a holistic concept concerned not only with content but equally attentive to peaceful methodology.

Celina Garcia (San José, Costa Rica)

They are certainly not the same, and I think they should all be used to describe the variety of approaches in our profession. You could also talk about education related to international law, for instance – that is also an important part of peace education. I like to think about peace education in terms of radical peace education. The other expressions represent different emphases that should remain separate, under what I consider the umbrella: Peace education.

ÅB: When you use the term "radical peace education", what do you primarily think about?

CG: For me radical peace education is education that is very critical of traditional education as it has been reserved for a privileged minor group.

Henk B. Gerritsma & Daan Verbaan (Groningen, The Netherlands)

DV: I prefer the term *education for international understanding*, and then I include all the problems of interstate and innerstate conflicts, the problems of underdevelopment of the Third World, and the problem of environmental pollution. Education for international understanding should work for better cooperation in order to solve these problems.

The term *disarmament education* focuses too much on the problems of armament and disarmament. This is only one of the international problems.

Peace education is a term which causes many misunderstandings. You have to make your definition of peace clear, before you start working with it. The word peace has been misused in many different ways.

HG: In my experience and opinion as well, peace education is a confusing term. In our Institute we try to avoid this term. Instead we have used the term "global education", and currently we are speaking of "education (conceived as learning) on international conflicts and problems" – subdivided into questions of war, armament and peace, of underdevelopment and development, and of environmental pollution and protection.

I do believe in a possibility to contribute, by means of education (especially conceived as learning), to more knowledge and insight, and to the awareness that, with regard to threatening conflicts and problems, different positions and choices are possible – that values play a prominent part when one has to decide on a position and an attitude. In that sense, awareness of values represented in the UN Charter and Declarations is essential; those values should be emphasized in education.

From our viewpoint and conception, education should contribute to 'international understanding and cooperation' and, as a consequence, to an 'international or global orientation'. As for the term 'disarmament education', I am very doubtful. Instead we use the term education (learning) on the problems of armament, arms control and disarmament as a part of education (learning) on questions of war and peace.

Haim Gordon (Beer-Sheva, Israel)

I think we have to link these terms to justice. I don't think we should just talk about disarmament education. I think one has to talk not only about a world order, but about a *just world order*. I think that justice has always to be at the head of our concerns when we are dealing with peace education. I

would stress *education for peace and justice*.

ÅB: What terms are used in Israel if they are doing something that you think of as peace education. Would they call it peace education?

HG: Yes, they would call it that or perhaps *education for dialogue*. – In Israel, there has been too little concern in the past, when dealing with peace education, about the global perspectives, and that's one of things that we are speaking out against. In Israel, there has been an emphasis on the importance of developing a strong nuclear program because of Iraq and Iran, and this is dealt with in the press again and again. So that is very far from peace education. As far as my wife and I have covered the press, which isn't that well because we have been out of the country for some time, nobody seems to have written against these tendencies. We should talk about nuclear disarmament, we should educate the world for nuclear disarmament, but nobody seems to have said that.

Magnus Haavelsrud (Tromsø, Norway)

I have never been drawn to "education for international understanding", maybe especially because I've had the impression that it's such a depoliticized concept. "Peace education", I suppose, is the term I prefer to use. In my opinion, peace education includes "disarmament education", "development education" as well as "human rights".

I don't favor "global education" either, since I'm trying to make the concept of peace as relevant on the local level as in the global perspective. The relationship between the local and the global is central in peace education. We have already talked about "schooling for peace". I'm primarily concerned with the cognitive element, with the good arguments in the good debate, you might say.

Ian M. Harris (Milwaukee, Wisconsin, USA)

In reference to the different terminologies of peace education you may be aware that here in the U.S., we have the organization "Educators for Social Responsibility". This organization has grown a lot; they have over 5000 members, and they are very active, promoting peace education. However, they have decided, tactically, to use the word "nuclear-age education". Their thinking is that we are now living in a nuclear age, and that we need

to understand and think about the ramifications of that age, that this period of time is different than any other period of time because of the nuclear weapons. For example, human beings now have the capacity to blow themselves up. We can't be guaranteed that there will be a future for the next generations. Within that context they are promoting "nuclear-age education" but basically teaching the same things that most of us who promote peace education are teaching.

I feel very strongly that their terminological choice is a mistake. I am a member of that organization. I have publicly tried to get them to endorse peace education, and I have critized their terminology "nuclear-age education". Basically, I feel that studying "nuclear-age education" is like a person who has a terminal disease, a cancer, spending the rest of your life studying that cancer, thinking about the fact that you are going to die and studying this awful, terrible aspect of life itself and how horrible it is you have this disease. Peace education on the other hand, involves the good sides of the human spirit. Throughout our history, human beings have worked for peace and strived to achieve peace. I think the peace education draws out the best that exist in human beings, the high moral road. I think it is extremely important always to take the highest possible moral road, and peace education is that road. Peace education talks about the abilities of human beings to love each other, to care for each other, to care for this planet, it draws upon deep feelings for social justice that exists in the human psyche. I think to use the term "nuclear age education" is to focus on the worst aspects, whereas to study peace education is to draw upon the best aspects of the human personality. Therefore I am very much in favour of that terminology, even though it *is* controversial.

"Disarmament education" has a similar negative concept. It is about doing away with arms in much the same way as nuclear-age education is about doing away with nuclear weapons. "Peace education", on the other hand, is about the best aspects of the human species, about its desires for peace and security, about its ability to love and cooperate. Those of us who value peace education must not let our efforts be conceptually denigrated by referring to it as something negative, e.g. disarmament education or nuclear-age education.

I understand that in Japan the Japanese people under the leadership of the teachers union have gone a long way towards implementing "A-bomb education" whose purpose is to help avoid the use of nuclear weapons. As important as it is to educate people about the dangers of nuclear weapons, I think it is important to realize that with peace education we are doing more

than averting disaster. We are drawing upon the very best aspects of the human species, those aspects that strive to create a secure existence for all creatures on this planet. By emphasizing the negative, I fear we loose sight of this higher moral purpose that motivates our work.

I like "global education" but it lacks a reference to "peace', a concept highly valued by human beings that rests at the core of all the great religions. Why should we abandon it for something less controversial? Why should we choose some term that is supposedly safe in order to give the impression that we are somehow innocent or more acceptable? I think what we are doing is very controversial. We are trying to save the souls of young people from the miasma of violence that spews forth in our societies. After all, the armies and navies of the world are out recruiting. We should understand that our efforts as peace educators are highly value-loaded. We are attempting to create a nonviolent future, and we shouldn't be cowardly about our efforts to recruit people away from violence towards peace.

I feel that "education for international understanding" is too vague. It is better to insist on peace education, emphasizing all the different aspects of our lives that are touched by our desires for peace and security. In other words, peace education is not just about ending wars. It concerns itself with violence, wherever it appears in our lives, educates us about the causes of that violence, and teaches us about nonviolent ways of dealing with violence. It is about building a beloved community. It concerns our friendships, the quality of our work lives, and the neighborhoods we inhabit. In order to live in peace, we need to learn how to resolve conflicts in our personal relations as well as mediate disputes between superpowers. This broad understanding of how important peace is to our daily existence makes "peace education" the most important of all these different titles for our peace education efforts.

Petra Hesse (Boston, Massachusetts, USA)

I think that "disarmament education" is too specific. I like "global education", because it acknowledges that we want children and adolescents to move beyond their own egocentric and ethnocentric concerns, and that we want them to be concerned about the future of the world, the future of all nations.

ÅB: What about "peace education"? Is that a term you use in communicating with teachers or colleagues?

PH: It's funny. I used to use "peace education", but I think it has recently become a little bit harder, and let me tell you why. I have been interested in conflict resolution. I have also become more interested in media literacy education, which is a whole field in its own right. Then, because this country is turning totally multicultural, I have been interested in multicultural education. "Peace education" would be wonderful as a term as long as we make it clear that peace education involves all of these different aspects. All these specialities are ultimately related, so I think I'm searching for a word or some way of referring to all of them, but there seems to be no such term.

David Hicks (Bath, England)

I know when I first came across the term "disarmament education" – I think it was in Magnus Haavelsrud's book – on the one hand I could understand that it was conceptually valuable within peace education. But I also thought that in busy classrooms and with busy teachers you don't start with that sort of terminology and that it wasn't helpful at all. It was difficult enough helping teachers to understand peace education, as a term they were not used to, without adding disarmament education as well!

The term "education for international understanding" I look upon as rather "wet". It has been used rather loosely in the U.K. for a long time. From the 1920s on there is a tradition in England of education for international understanding, but in these days we're more likely to talk about global education or peace education. I think people in England find the terms "global education" and "world studies" less threatening than peace education. It doesn't sound as subversive as peace education! Certainly the project that I was involved with – the World Studies 8-13 Project – had a much wider take-up than things I did under a peace education heading, and teachers sometimes commented: "I'm really glad that project was called 'World Studies'; if it would have been called Peace Education 8-13, my head teacher wouldn't have allowed me to come on the course." I actually think that one can equally study issues of peace and conflict under a global education heading.

ÅB: Is the term world studies used generally in your country or is it fairly specific for your project?

DH: It's not used generally in the sense that most teachers would be conversant with it – unless they have come across some of the few projects

that use that term. York University has a Centre for Global Education. They changed their name from including world studies to global education. I guess they felt global education gave a broader field than world studies.

Kathleen Kanet (New York, USA)

I think my preference would be "education for peace, justice and human liberation". I think I will have a negative response now to "disarmament education", but I already mentioned why. I also have some concern about a phenomenon now, the fact that conflict management or conflict analysis and programs related to that in the elementary and secondary schools are becoming very legitimate and also are beginning to be funded. Certainly it is a step forward, but conflict management is not necessarily saying that we want to change the way things are organized, for example, towards more justice. I want to keep the dialogue going about what really constitutes peace education. I don't think that conflict studies per se *is* peace education or that conflict management per se *is* peace education.

ÅB: What about the terms "global education" and "education for international understanding"?

KK: Another aspect of my work is that I am associated with a group called "The Christian Initiative Center of International Learning", an initiative of a group of theologians, social pedagogues and sociologists, mostly associated with the Catholic church in the FRG, all of them having had experience in third world groups. The concept there is "international learning", but the idea is to bring together people on the grassroots level who are working in democratic processes or liberational struggles, saying: What can we learn from one another? It is also linking of grassroots experience with the social sciences, so there is a place where they can come together and talk to one another; sometimes the academics are critical of the grassroots because there is action with no reflection – and with the academics there may be reflection with no action.

ÅB: How would you define "liberation" in this context?

KK: It's not so easy. I don't want to say it's freedom, but in a sense it's related to freedom: When one is able to grow and to express oneself to one's potential. But we have to say "we", because it's not only self-liberation like the individualistic American, but it's when we as a country like the Philippines in a sense is liberated – is able to express itself and to grow to what its capacity is. And I can't liberate you, you can't liberate me – it has

to be self-liberation. But we can learn; if you tell me your story, and I tell you my story, we can help one another. It implies a certain mutuality; a common recognition that it's not only the Philippines that needs to be liberated, it's the U.S. that needs to be liberated; and it's not only you that needs to be liberated, it's me that needs to be liberated.

Søren Keldorff (Aalborg, Denmark)

Yes, first of all I have a pragmatic attitude to terms in general: that you should take great pains to try to find the expressions that correspond best to what teachers and students actually say. As you know, language is a living thing in a constant state of change, and it could very well be that none of the terms mentioned above is quite appropriate. Why not "knowledge of the world", for example? When I was at school 25 years ago, social studies had just been introduced as a subject. The transition from "the society" to "the world" illustrates quite well what we are talking about, I think. In those days, talking about "social studies" meant an enormous expansion of school activities. Today, however, we cannot limit ourselves to that area but must adopt the global perspective.

ÅB: In Sweden it has been discussed whether this area should be called "fredsfostran" ("rearing/training for peace") or "fredsundervisning" ("peace-related instruction"). Swedish-speaking Finns like to talk about "fredsfostran", while the Swedish Board of Education now prefers the term "fredsundervisning". Has there been a similar discussion in Denmark? And what is your own attitude to this?

SK: The word "opdragelse" sounds a bit old-fashioned in Danish, since it makes you think about good order and discipline. Since people on both the right and the left of the political spectrum associate it with the word "compulsion", it cannot be used for that reason alone. The word "undervisning" is more neutral in Danish and is probably a happier choice.

But once I have said this, I would like to claim that, fundamentally, what we are talking about is "uppfostran" – in the sense that we are faced with the necessity of reintroducing ethical or moral issues into our teaching. It is no longer sufficient to talk about "general subjects", where the students, by means of the philosophy of the Age of Enlightenment and a democratic way of thinking, are supposed to be made conscious of a foundation that will enable them to make their own choice. Historically, we have arrived at an intersection where the freedom to choose, for example, to

continue recklessly overexploiting nature, or to heedlessly push technological growth, can no longer be allowed, since the Nemesis of the industrial era is now striking back at us. This may sound a bit solemn, but that is how I see it.

Herbert C. Kelman (Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA)

I have not been involved very much in these debates, so I don't know what all the choices are. But looking just at the terms you have mentioned here, I would prefer the broader terminology.

To me, for example, "disarmament education" would be far too narrow because it has implicit in it a particular approach to peace. I am in favour of disarmament; but I think that in some respects use of this term means falling into the trap that I was talking about, i.e., looking at security in exclusively military terms. I think disarmament is too narrow.

I think also that "education for international understanding" is too narrow. The problem is not just international understanding. There is an implication in that term – to me at least – that if only people could understand each other better, have more appreciation of their diversity, we would have peace. Again I regard these as very good things, but I don't think that those are the only or even the major issues in questions of war and peace. Cultural understanding in itself is not going to create peace. I think this is part of a larger process.

So from that point of view I would prefer something that's broad, even if it is admittedly very loose and vague. So I would prefer "peace education" to something that is more specific but therefore more restricted.

What then about "global education"? I happen to believe that one of the most important things in thinking about peace is to adopt a global perspective. I am surprised that this hasn't come up before in our conversation because it is really central to my thinking; it is at the same level as what I was trying to say about security. One of the assumptions built into our thinking is that the world by its nature is a system consisting of sovereign nation states. The idea of the nation state dominates and constrains our thinking. Even when we talk about international relations or the international system, we are building into these terms the assumption that the system of nation states as we now know it is the way of organizing the world, as if God had created the world as a system of nation states. I am not against nation states; I am a gradualist, and I think that nation states are going to be around for a

long time. But I think we need also to develop a different perspective on the concept of the nation state and I think that would be an important part of peace education – and probably a very controversial one, because the educational system has characteristically been owned by the state. It is the way in which the state propagates its ideology – and part of that ideology is that the nation state is the sovereign element in the world.

Anyway, the point I want to make is that, although I am not proposing that we should or could do away with nation states, it's very important for social scientists and analysts, and I would say by the same token for educators, to have a perspective on this institution: to recognize that nation states represent only *one* way in which the world can be organized, but that we often think about them as the only way. However, in many respects we are already operating as a global society, and we should certainly keep open the option of increasingly adopting a global framework. So to me the more appropriate way of looking at the so-called international system is as a global society, and in that sense a term like "global education" appeals to me.

What worries me about this term is that it may be seen as pushing for a particular ideology. I remember when we were trying to introduce here at Harvard the undergraduate program I talked about earlier (Question 1), we had a lot of problems. We finally called it international studies, but first we called it peace and conflict studies, and some of the people on the faculty council thought that that was too normative, too value-laden. Then the idea came up to call it world order studies, and that too was rejected as being too normative. So I can see that if you call this area global education, some people may read this as an attempt to propagate an ideology of world federalism or the like. From an analytic point of view, I think it is much more sensible to think about a global or world society which can organize itself in a variety of ways; so a global perspective appeals to me. But perhaps it might create problems to put this idea into the name.

In sum, I have the feeling that peace education is better than any of the other alternatives you list here, although I haven't thought about all other possible alternatives.

ÅB: What about the term "peace education" in the United States? Has not this term also evoked some controversy here?

HK: Yes, it has, because again I guess it implies to many people a particular value stance. It implies to them peace at the expense of national security or national preparedness. At one level I don't quite see how anybody could object to the term, but in fact people do. I think it suggests something about priorities of values that evokes negative feelings among the more conserv-

ative elements of this society. I don't think you have the same kind of situation in Sweden, for instance, since Sweden hasn't been an active participant in the Cold War and has a tradition of peace as a positive value. But here it may be more controversial. As far as I know, people generally talk about curricula for nuclear education, rather than about peace education as such, but the reference to nuclear war has also evoked some controversy.

As I see it, peace education has to do with questions of security, broadly conceived, and certainly questions of avoiding war. That implies a value position, but I cannot see how a preference for avoiding war in itself can be considered a controversial value position. So assuring security and avoiding war are central themes, and these are related to establishing some kind of order in the world, which of course means dealing with questions of distributing resources, protecting the environment, and safeguarding human rights. I don't know of a better term than peace education to cover all of this.

Alberto L'Abate (Florence, Italy)

Personally I am not so interested in these different terminologies. I use the terminology that Galtung uses: research, formation or education and action. I think we have to work on these three levels. I think that it is important to see how research can be used for education, to see how education can be useful for action and how action can be studied by research in order to get better action.The main point for me is to create people who know what they are doing, who are conscious of the consequences of what they are doing and in that sense they make real choices. The big problem for peace is not those who are for war – these are very few. The problem is those, about 80 % of the people, who are just passive. I think it is important to involve them in action, research and education, to take them from what I call the daily alienation. They think it is impossible to do anything: "Yes, I am for peace, but what can I do?"

Linda Lantieri (New York, USA)

My feeling is that in the US the first two expressions, "disarmament education" and "peace education", easily arouse suspicions and fears that we are doing something very political, and that we have a very specific political

point of view and agenda. So we tend to often refer to what we are doing more as "cr ative conflict ,esolution". We would probably tend to choose "global education" or "education for international understanding" as alternatives. My preferences are simply based on the fact that many people react negatively to the other terms. For example, our first version of our curriculum was called "Creating Peace", but we are not using that as our title now, but rather "Resolving Conflict Creatively". When using the first title, we were misunderstood in terms of what we were really teaching.

Max Lawson (Armidale, New South Wales, Australia)

I consider peace studies to be the umbrella word, and under this you have peace research, peace education and peace activism. You can of course be interested in one of these, two of these or all three. The Center for Peace Studies at the Australian National University deals with peace research as such. Peace education includes conflict resolution, human rights education, some aspects of multi-cultural education, race relations, development education and disarmament education. Disarmament education is only a small part of what I consider to be peace education.

Stig Lindholm (Copenhagen, Denmark; Sweden)

As I mentioned earlier, I do not like to use the Swedish term "fredsfostran". I think there are too many of us who associate "fostran" ("rearing", "training" or "upbringing") with authoritarianism. In adult education, for example, it feels a bit presumptuous to "bring up" your fellow human beings. Consequently I call it a "pedagogy for development and peace", but that may be perceived as a research area. If we say "peace education, development education and education about human rights", it sounds clumsy. But if we say "fredsundervisning" ("peace-related instruction"), some people may only think about fighting against nuclear weapons and armament. It is too narrow a peace concept. That is why I want to include "development".

ÅB: You don't feel that the term "undervisning" itself refers to too narrow a concept?

SL: I am uncertain about that. To some people, "undervisning" may only represent facts and cognitive matters. Personally, I have a lot of faith in the

importance of the example. Teachers convey facts, but they are also, for better or for worse, examples of how you behave in life. This is an important element of being a teacher, whether you are a professor or an upper-secondary or elementary-school teacher. I'm not sure whether it's part of the concept of "undervisning". There was a period, maybe in the 50s, 60s and 70s, when it was not "with-it" for adults to set a good example. It was not quite accepted, and, understandably, there was opposition to authoritarian child-rearing in those days. But I think we are shutting our eyes to reality if we don't perceive that we do indeed set an example.

ÅB: How do you look at the English terms that were mentioned earlier: "disarmament education", "global education", "education for international understanding"?

SL: When I hear "disarmament education", I think about UNESCO; they are the ones who have used that term a lot, I think. But as a matter of fact, I find it too narrow. It may have been politically motivated to use it in some contexts, but it's much too narrow. "Global education", on the other hand, tends to become vague and fuzzy – it doesn't appeal to me very much. I find "education for international understanding" a better term, but that, too, is a bit vague. I myself would insist on propounding the term "development and peace education" in order to emphasize that we go outside the narrow concept of "peace", but without widening the field into "education for all good things". Admittedly, it's a bit difficult to translate "development education". I don't think we have quite succeeded in doing that. When I speak about it as a research area, I call it a "pedagogy for development and peace". As a teaching assignment, I might call it "teaching the issues of peace and development", but I haven't really thought this through yet. I think the most important thing is that the word "development" should be included, and then you will have to discuss what it should contain. In that way, you emphasize that it's not only a matter of disarmament education.

ÅB: What do you personally think of first when you speak about development in this context?

SL: Then I think about the development in the rich and the poor countries, as well as the relationship between them. I also find it important to link development with peace, because that is how you can introduce the concepts of "security" and "vulnerability". I think it's important to see to it that there are possibilities for action whenever you teach about peace and development. Furthermore, it's essential to try to dissolve this unfortunate dichotomy: either you are a pacifist, and then you are against any kind of military defense, or you are a militarist, and then you want the defense that

we already have, only more of it.

This attitude, which I think is shared by many people, is untenable. We must have a discussion about an alternative security policy. I myself am not a pacifist; I think it would be unfortunate if we started to disarm unilaterally, because that would worry one of the blocs; but I'm not at all sure that we have the best type of security system. We must link our security thinking to our development and consider the risks of concentrating on enormous large-scale production. I think we have only got one yeast factory, and there aren't many shoe factories left. Our computer systems and nuclear power plants are vulnerable. In many ways, we live in an extremely vulnerable society. However, security also involves seeing to it that we are less vulnerable: how is the production of essential goods organized? It needs to be decentralized, to put it simply.

I hope the debate about alternative security and what security means will become more sophisticated in the next ten years. Then, military defense will be *one* part of our security policy, but the domestic organization of our production and administration is also an important part, and the current situation is frightening. You only have to think about the power outage on 27 December a couple of years ago to realize how easily we are neutralized. And imagine a terrorist at a nuclear power plant – it isn't easy to negotiate there. I think a discussion of those questions of vulnerability would get many more people involved than those who are prepared to call themselves peace activists today. I would like these things to be included in peace education.

Mildred Masheder (London, England)

There are many more related terms. I am not so keen on "disarmament education", because I think it's a very small aspect. I would like to see the question of the interrelationship between these various subfields be emphasized, for example, between "human rights education" and "education for preserving the planet". I don't agree too much with the people who feel that we need one great umbrella term for all these aspects. I think at this stage people should be free to feel strongly about various aspects of education and work for them all.

Gerald F. Mische (New York, USA)

I would prefer to say "education for and about global interdependence". International education or international understanding is only part of it. And disarmament education is only part of that. I prefer "education for and about global interdependence" also because it is more acceptable; disarmament and peace are loaded terms in our society. I would include justice and equity – for peace without justice isn't going to work. But I would not use justice in the title.

Valentina Mitina (Moscow, Russia)

To my mind "disarmament education" is a part of peace education or global education – one of the important parts. "Education for international understanding" is also a part of peace education or global education. First I preferred the term "international education", but now I think that "global education" is better. Many of the problems that we have are really global.

Robert Muller (Escazu, Costa Rica; New York, USA)

In my opinion "global education" should come first, "education for international understanding" second, "peace education" third, and "disarmament education" fourth. If you read the book on peace education written by Betty Reardon, professor at Columbia University's Teachers College and former member of the Council of the University for Peace, you will find out why. She starts peace education with the unique experience of the United Nations. Then follows my world core curriculum as the broadest framework of global education. And then she goes into peace education as the treatment of the current problems of war and peace we have on this planet, the "problematique" of peace. Among the questions of the problematique of peace there is security and disarmament.

I would not put disarmament as the question number one as the Soviet Union does. If we could have immediate disarmament it would be wonderful, but this is not the case as long as we have the nation state system. In my view global education is the most promising longterm avenue. After that, more understanding between nations is the way that can bring about more peace, then education of peace and finally education on disarmament.

Eva Nordland (Oslo, Norway)

I can't really say that I have any preference, since all those terms remind me of important aspects of the wider concept of peace. When we discuss one of those individual aspects, we should also keep all the other, related ones in mind, not because we should immediately jump over to those other elements but because we should be aware that we haven't got very far, that there are many other issues to deal with. When you have been working with the issues of development for a while, you address the issues of disarmament, and that's when you begin to discern the connection between development and disarmament, thus adding another incredibly important dimension to your peace work.

ÅB: Which term do you yourself prefer to use?

EN: It varies, depending on which group I'm working with. Sometimes the term "international education" is the best one when you want to establish contact. In other contexts it may be better to have "the environment and development" as your starting-point. I use the terms alternately, depending on what I know about my listeners and what I want to achieve in communicating with them.

Mitsuo Okamoto (Hiroshima, Japan)

We touched on this earlier. I prefer the term "peace studies" or "peace research", or even expressions like "conflict resolution". I tend to avoid the term "peace education", since it has a certain negative connotation in some circles. However, in Japan there are differences of opinion in this respect, and every year we have a peace education symposium. Usually it takes place in Hiroshima, but this year it took place in Nagasaki. Then the term "peace education" is in focus. It is mainly visited by junior high and senior high teachers and elementary school teachers. We organized a university professors section about five years ago, but this is a minority in this set-up. This year I was the keynote speaker. The symposia are arranged by a permanent organization, called, I think, The Institute for Peace Education; the headquarters is in Hiroshima. This group also publish a magazine on peace education.

Priscilla Prutzman (Nyack, New York, USA)

I always liked the term "awareness". We use the term "bias awareness". I think there is an underlying assumption for us that if we present an issue to a group, such as resolving a conflict, that when the group really examines both sides of it, they will inevitably choose the non-violent solution. I'd like to think that people will inevitably when they see what's going on, choose the least biased approach; it's based on a very optimistic view of the world. I like the term "global awareness" too: that we begin to see ourselves as part of a whole. But we are not forcing anybody to see things that way which sometimes some of the other terms that are used imply. We don't want to use a dominating technique. We want people to be choosing for themselves. We want people to be empowered to make the decisions for themselves.

ÅB: How would you see the relations between the terms you now mentioned – awareness, bias awareness, global awareness – and what you have in your own title – creative conflict resolution – and the term peace education. Could you say something about how you feel these relate to each other?

PP: Well, our title is creative response to conflict although we also use creative conflict resolution. It has changed so much actually since we began. The term peace education used to be considered as a really radical, "communist" kind of thing. Now, however, peace education is a positive word, it's education for how we become peaceful, so I don't really have a problem using the term. We continue using conflict resolution because it involves teaching the *skills* of resolving conflicts which is more relevant to schools.

ÅB: Would you agree that what you have been saying means that peace education is the wider thing, within that creative response to conflict is a somewhat smaller area, and within that again awareness would be a smaller area.

PP: I think in general, yes. Although, I think that conflict resolution is a fairly general term too, and I think that in some ways you could almost use them interchangeably, if by conflict resolution you mean creating the stage where conflicts can be resolved. Earlier conflict resolution was seen as the skills and peace education was seen more as the movement, but there has been a real change.

ÅB: Sometimes there has been, in the discussion among peace educators, the feeling that conflict resolution might be so much skill-related that it doesn't include consideration of justice aspects and global affairs.

PP: I think one leads to the other. Once people get the skills then they begin

seeing also global issues. It's a way into the doors of those people who otherwise might have been the people five years ago who were saying peace education, that's for sissies or that's for commies – or whatever word they might be using in that year. I think that one leads to the other. Attention to conflict resolution can lead to very radical action.

ÅB: But sometimes conflict resolution is used in terms of conflict management in a way that perhaps ignores the underlying problems. But that is not the way you use the term, I guess?

PP: No, not at all. One of the very important theoretical bases for the Quaker project way back when we were starting was Paulo Freire, and if we ever thought in terms of what's our philosophical base was way back then, we used to say it's Freire, and that has to do with individual and group empowerment: We can make changes and improvements in our life. So it's not just skills, but it's a way of getting into the door from an educator's perspective.

ÅB: There is another thing I would like to ask you about. I have been in contact earlier with Linda Lantieri and her co-workers in New York, and they have a program which is similar in terms, dealing with creative conflict resolution. How similar are these approaches? Do you feel that this is the same thing as you have been talking about or is it different?

PP: One reason the programs are so similar is that they came to us to help them to start the program. One third of their manual is our manual. A difference, however, between the two programs is that they have become institutionalized: they are now part of the New York City Board of Education.

ÅB: Basically you see that these programs have a similar way of looking at things and handling things?

PP: Basically, yes. They used to be called The Model Peace Education Program and they changed their title to The Resolving Conflict Creatively Program. We still work together.

Hanns-Fred Rathenow (Berlin, Germany)

Traditionally our education system is almost past and present-oriented although it pretends to educate students for their future life. Contrary to that, global education as developed at the York Centre for Global Education by Selby and Pike could be the broadest term for all kinds of positive education. Global education has five goals; they are systems consciousness; perspective consciousness; health of planet awareness; involvement conscious-

ness and preparedness and process mindedness. Systems consciousness means the ability to think in a systems mode avoiding dualities like cause and effect, observer and observed, local and global and consider phenomena in interactive relations. The spider's web could be the image for this mode of thinking. Peace education obviously – as defined before – should use these goals and consider them as its basis. You mentioned disarmament education. I would consider it as part of education for peace, with a strong impetus on units concerned with the arms race, the nuclear threat etc. The expression international understanding has been used extensively in UN and UNESCO documents, and this meaning is quite close to peace education. However, it is limited to some extent. We have to live in harmony with nature – this is a very important objective for peace education – but there is hardly a relationship to education for international understanding. Global education includes also a dimension related to environmental education and to our habits as consumers. Do we buy our coffee in Third World shops, do we really need window frames made from mahogany out of the tropical rain forests? Global awareness and global values should permeate our everyday values.

Douglas Ray (London, Ontario, Canada)

Because of the work that I am now doing, I prefer to use the word "human rights education" as a generic, all embracing kind of umbrella term. To me "human rights education" includes the right to life. Disarmament education and peace education involve essentially the right to life. In the case of peace education the right to justice should be included and that is dealt with in several aspects of human rights education. The idea of conflict resolution in a nonviolent way I think is consistent with human rights education. Global education might extend beyond human rights education as typically conceived, particularly because it has more of a scientific and environmental context. The only way in which human rights can get at this, is to talk about how the present generation of people on the earth should be custodian, having a responsibility to the future. The rights of future generations give us the responsibilities to ensure that they will survive in that future.

Education for international understanding is now an archaic term. You must deal with education for understanding among peoples, but the problem with the term international is the emphasis on nation. We have to deal with differences among people, whether these differences are identified with

language, religion, race, nation, or any other form of distinction. These types of distinctions are essentially arbitrary, they are associated with important cultural differences in many cases, but nevertheless these cultural differences are not necessary to the existence of the human being. Therefore it's terribly important for kids to look at the relationships at both the personal and the global level, but the nation level is only one of many possible groupings, and we should not over-emphasize that.

As to the term disarmament education, I think that disarmament (if nothing more is done) is a very partial solution. It does not deal adequately with conflict resolution, and it does not deal adequately with the removal of injustices. By removing one of the means by which conflicts might be resolved, you do not necessarily promote resolution. So disarmament education is highly desirable, but unless a lot of the other things take place at the same time, it is completely inadequate.

Betty Reardon (New York, USA)

The terms mentioned refer to different, although related topics, that is, they are not substitutional. They are based on different assumptions about the nature and causes of global problems and therefore use somewhat different analytic and pedagogical approaches. I deal with these differences in some detail in my book on comprehensive peace education. I prefer the term peace education that for me covers both disarmament education and the broader fields of global education. As I see it, it has the potential to be the truly comprehensive type of education we need in a global nuclear age.

Tom Roderick (New York, USA)

I wish we could find better terms, because I don't think any of those terms are good, but I haven't been able to think of a better term myself.

ÅB: Is it correct that you are still avoiding the term "peace education" within ESR?

TR: Yes, we usually don't talk about peace education. I have problems with it. It isn't just for political reasons that people have attacked it. I don't think anybody wants war, so for us to say that we're doing peace education as distinct from what someone else is doing seems to me a little bit pretentious. I can see why the term bothers people.

Paul Rogers (Belfast, Northern Ireland)
& Maura Ward (Blackrock, Co. Dublin, Ireland)

MW: "Disarmament education" is very narrow. This deals only with one very small aspect of "peace education".
PR: I like the term "peace education". It is a more allembracing term than some of the others and suggests a more positive approach. It is also now a fairly well established term internationally and is gaining ground in our country. "Education for international understanding" and some of the other terms you mention are more restrictive than "peace education".

Bogdan Rowinski (Konstancin, Poland)

To me peace education is the most general concept and "disarmament education" is a more limited area dealing with the negative side of peace education, for instance. "Education for international understanding and human rights" is also one part of peace education.
AB: Is peace education a common conception in your country?
BR: Yes.

Paul Smoker (Yellow Springs, Ohio, USA)

Personally not a lot; no. I understand often why people use one term instead of another, and quite often this is because of the political context, the social context or the cultural context within which they are operating. I think it's very important to respect that so I try to be sensitive to that. If people are talking about global education rather than peace education, it *may* be to avoid a hostile reaction from other people that could actually interfere with the educational process.
AB: When you talk about this in your institute, what terms do you usually use?
PS: We teach a course in peace studies and it's called peace studies, and this is agreed to by the university. We also have strategic studies, we have defence studies, so if we didn't have peace studies, the place would look like it was run by the army. I am an old-time liberal in the sense that I believe you should be able to teach anything at universities; there should be no taboos. Therefore I have defended my friends who teach defence studies and are

paid by the British Defence Department. I personally don't agree with their viewpoint, but I agree absolutely with their right to have defence studies at the university.

Toh Swee-Hin (Edmonton, Alberta, Canada)

I personally prefer "peace education"; any expression that has "peace" in it. I think "peace" is a very crucial word in the human vocabulary. I do not think the term peace should be left to the conservative forces of the world who mean war when they talk about "peace". But I can understand why, in some situations, some terms like "global education" or "international understanding" may have to be used in order to make progress in implementing peace education. So at a practical level it doesn't matter so much which term you use. But one has to be aware, when using "global education", that there are conservative paradigms of "global education" which are quite different from the peace education perspective. I have seen some curriculum materials, made in the name of "global education", which embody assumptions contrary to the peace paradigm.

Judith Torney-Purta (College Park, Maryland, USA)

I see "human rights education" as a term covering many of these things. As I have said earlier, I do not like the term "disarmament education" and I am uncertain about "peace education" as this is often used. I often talk about "education with global perspectives" or about "international education". I have never felt I fully grasped what "education for international understanding" is. For that reason, I was always glad that UNESCO included "human rights" in the title of the UNESCO recommendation on education.

Lennart Vriens (Utrecht, The Netherlands)

I prefer the term "peace education", and maybe I can use "global education". But I think that such things as "disarmament education" and "education for international understanding" are only parts of peace education. In my opinion, peace – especially positive peace – is more than disarmament, and I think that one of the worst things about the peace movement has been

that it has *not* been a peace movement, but only a disarmament movement, or even a nuclear disarmament movement and nothing else. However, you sometimes choose a term for strategic reasons. For example, "global education" may be a better term for governments than peace education.

In my thesis, I elaborated a theory of a pedagogy of hope. A concept of positive peace can be a concept of hope for education. The positive peace concept can be a very good description of a hopeful future. It has some potentials for being a concrete, realistic utopia, and I think education needs something like a realistic utopia. Education is an intentional process, and I think one of the problems of most educators, and even politicians, is that they have no explicit idea of the intentions of education.

ÅB: Have people in your country ever reacted negatively to the term peace education?

LV: Yes, there have been some negative reactions. Politicians have often accused peace educators of being guilty of indoctrination, and the politicians never have to argue about it. Our former Prime Minister said that peace education is anti-Americanism and indoctrination of the worst kind, and when he was invited to discuss it, he said: No, that's not necessary. I made a conceptual analysis of indoctrination in my thesis, because I think peace educators must be careful not to indoctrinate children and youngsters. But most people who accuse peace educators of being guilty of indoctrination only seem to say: "You just teach children things that I don't want you to teach them." And then they use the term indoctrination.

Riitta Wahlström (Jyväskylä, Finland)

To me, peace education is the broader concept, under which there may be various narrower areas, such as disarmament education or education for international understanding. I prefer to use the term peace education. To me it is important to give the students a broad view of this area and to get them to understand the interrelatedness of, for example, racism, inequality and armaments. Consequently, it would not be a good strategy to single out one part of the total complex problem area. Hence, my preference for a broad teaching strategy leads me to prefer a broad term.

Zimarian J. Walker (Brasilia, Brazil)

I always use the positive when I can. The only thing you can do with a negative concept is to work against it. This is important too, but it shouldn't be the first thing that hits your mind and heart. So I prefer "peace education". I would not use the term "disarmament education". I would use the concepts of disarmament education – of course they are important but that wouldn't be where I start. "Global education" is allright, but I prefer "peace education".

Christoph Wulf (Berlin, Germany)

The concept of "education for disarmament" is too narrow for me. Peace education covers more than arms reduction. By contrast to this, I prize the concepts of "global education" and "international education". The concept of "global education" indicates the common task of all nations in maintaining and forming the world. A similar thought is found in the concept of "international education". This concept, which has been chiefly propagated by Unesco, focusses on the need for international understanding and international co-operation. What appeals to me in the concept of peace education is its critical dimension, which is chiefly provided by reference to a positive concept of peace with the aim of producing social justice in all human concerns.

Richard Yarwood (London, England)

It's interesting to think about why these words have been chosen. A lot of people have very deliberately gone away from the term "peace", because it has "political" associations, and some people feel that it's just not worth the bother to push through all that, but it's much better just to change the term.

However, I think it's important to stick with the term peace, because I think it's important that *you* define its meaning rather than having its meaning defined elsewhere. For example, we have had peace in Europe for 40 years now according to one definition of peace, but one could argue that it is a partial peace, but not proper peace. So I think that it's important that we stick to the word peace as well, and if it's made into a political debate, I think we can be confident that we are doing things in a proper professional

way and that we display good arguments for our cause. But I do understand people who prefer to use other terms in order to get away from that controversy.

Disarmament education is a very specific part of peace education – it's a core topic area. I think it is reasonable to give topic areas specific terms.

ÅB: Is that term used much in this country?

RY: I think it was popular at one stage, but what happened was that people realized that if you are going to look at why we need disarmament, you have to go back and back and back and start looking at other things, and then you suddenly realize that disarmament is only a function of many other things, and that disarmament is a part of peace education. Peace education to me is a holistic term, similar to global education, I suppose. It's interesting that the World Studies Teacher Training Center, which is a very prominent teacher training establishment in York, has changed its name to Center for Global Education.

Education for international understanding again means slightly different things to me. It focuses on multicultural and international issues. David Hicks in one article tried to identify the key issues of some of these contemporary subjects. The key issue for peace education is conflict, whereas in development education or world studies it's power!

Nigel Young (Hamilton, New York, USA)

I like the word "peace". The word "education" has problems for me, so I would tend to talk as I said about "peace learning" or "peace studies" rather than "peace education", but I would keep the word "peace". It should be "global", and it should include "disarmament". But "peace", I think, is a good central term.

ÅB: When you use the expression "peace studies", in what respect does this have different connotations from "peace education" for you?

NY: "Studies" to me means that you study something and you don't know the answer, whereas the danger of the word "education" is that there is an answer and you have to give it.

References

Bjerstedt, Å. (Ed.) Fifty peace educators: Self-portraits in passing from twenty-two countries. *Peace Education Reports*, No. 7, 1993. (a)

Bjerstedt, Å. Peace education in schools around the world at the beginning of the 1990s: Some data from questionnaires to ministries of education and members of the Peace Education Commission. In: Bjerstedt, Å. (Ed.) *Peace education: Global perspectives*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1993. Pp. 149-169. (b)

Bjerstedt, Å. The meaning of "peace education": Associations, emphases, and sub-categories. *Peace Education Reports*, No. 9, 1994.

"Peace Education Miniprints" are published and distributed by the R&D Group "Preparedness for Peace" (address: School of Education, Box 23501, S-200 45 Malmö, Sweden).

At present "Peace Education Miniprints" will also function as aids in the networking activities of PEC/IPRA (the Peace Education Commission of the International Peace Research Association).

ISSN 1101-6418

BEST COPY AVAILABLE